

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application.

Claims 1-12 are pending. Claims 1-5 and 7-12 have been amended. Support can be found in, for example, Figure 16 of Applicant's Specification as filed. No new matter has been added. Claims 13-17 have been newly added. Support can be found in, for example, paragraph [0080] and Figure 16 of Applicant's Specification as filed. No new matter has been added.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected independent claims 1, 2, 5, 8 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on U.S. Patent No. 7,206,804 of Deshpande et al. ("Deshpande") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,708,309 of Blumberg ("Blumberg") and U.S. Patent No. 7,127,673 of Iwata et al. ("Iwata").

Claim 1, as amended, relates to displaying *multiple* thumbnail images *with different resolutions* in a single view for data files of *different format types*. More specifically, claim 1 recites "storing ... a plurality of first compressed codes ...," "setting a plurality of resolutions of the plurality of thumbnail images in accordance with the format types of a plurality of data files," and "wherein the plurality of data files correspond to the plurality of first compressed codes." Claim 1 further recites "extracting a plurality of second compressed codes according to the plurality of resolutions from the first compressed codes ...," and "displaying, in a single view, the

plurality of thumbnail images based on the plurality of second compressed codes, wherein *the displayed thumbnail images have different resolutions and correspond to the plurality of data files of different format types.*"

Deshpande does not disclose or suggest such operations for displaying multiple *thumbnails* as required by claim 1. In Deshpande, a user may select a resolution of *main image* according to her present needs *upon viewing thumbnail*. (See col. 12, ln. 23-25; Figures 8 through 11) Moreover, no part of Deshpande discloses or suggests "displaying, in a single view, the plurality of thumbnail images ... wherein the displayed thumbnail images have different resolutions and correspond to the plurality of data files of different format types," as recited in claim 1 and as shown in Figure 16 of Applicant's Specification as filed.

Blumberg does not help Deshpande render claim 1 unpatentable. Blumberg also teaches that a user may select a resolution of *main image* included in a web page (as shown in Figure 3) *after viewing thumbnail* in an initial view. In contrast, claim 1 requires selecting resolutions of *thumbnails* according to the format types of data files.

Furthermore, like Deshpande, Blumberg fails to disclose or suggest "displaying, in a single view, the plurality of thumbnail images ... wherein the displayed thumbnail images have different resolutions and correspond to the plurality of data files of different format types," as required by claim 1.

Iwata does not fill the gap in Blumberg and Deshpande. Iwata takes an approach different from that of claim 1 in displaying documents. The display system 100 of Iwata *ignores the font size designated in text data (T/D) of document data* as shown in Figure 2. Instead, the display system 100 determines *a new font size* (using a font size list as shown in Figure 10) in accordance with *display resolution of display unit 11*. The display system 100 then calculates a *display size* based on the new font size and the display resolution of display unit 11. (See, for example, col.6, ln. 1-23; col. 10, ln. 1-20) A distinction should be made between *display size* and *resolution* of image data. A distinction should also be made between resolution of *display unit* and resolution of *image data*. Therefore, Iwata does not teach or suggest “*setting ... resolutions of ... thumbnail images in accordance with the format types of ... data files,*” as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, it is clear that Iwata does not disclose or suggest “*displaying, in a single view, the plurality of thumbnail images ... wherein the displayed thumbnail images have different resolutions and correspond to the plurality of data files of different format types,*” as recited in claim 1.

Because a combination of Iwata, Blumberg and Deshpande fails to teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claim 1 as discussed above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Iwata, Blumberg and Deshpande.

Claims 2, 5, 8 and 11 contain similar limitations as the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, at least for the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 5, 8 and 11 in view of Iwata, Blumberg and Deshpande.

Claims 3-4, 6-7, 9-10 and 12 depend, directly or indirectly, from one of claims 2, 5, 8 and 11, respectively and thus, include the limitations set forth in their respective base claim. Therefore, at least for the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3-4, 6-7, 9-10 and 12 in view of Iwata, Blumberg and Deshpande.

Newly added claims 13-17 depend from claims 1, 2, 5, 8 and 11, respectively and thus, include the limitations set forth in their respective base claim. Therefore, at least for the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 13-17 are allowable over the cited references.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Any necessary extension of time for response not already requested is hereby requested. Please charge any corresponding fee to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: November 3, 2008



Michael J. Mallie
Reg. No. 36,591

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300